## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,	Case No. CR 17-00615 JD
Plaintiff, v. ) Kelsey Robert Jackson, a/p/a Kelsey Scales, Defendant. )	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT UNTIL JANUARY 24, 2018
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on December 18, 2017, the Court excludes time under the Speedy Trial Act from December 18, 2017 to Tapuary 24, 2018 and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):	
Failure to grant a continuance would be likely to See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	o result in a miscarriage of justice.
The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [che defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate itself within the time limits established by this se	or the existence of novel questions of fact preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial
Failure to grant a continuance would deny the de taking into account the exercise of due diligence	
Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.  See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	
Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonable necessary for effective preparation, taking into a See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	oly deny the defendant the reasonable time account the exercise of due diligence. LED
IT IS SO ORDERED.	DEC 19 2017
DATED: 12 19 17	JOSEPH C. SPERO Chief Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney